

EXHIBIT “C”

TASER International’s 2007 SEC Filings

Table of Contents

TASER INTERNATIONAL, INC.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (unaudited) — Continued

Legal proceedings

Securities Litigation

Securities Class Action Litigation

Beginning on or about January 10, 2005, numerous securities class action lawsuits were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors. These actions were filed on behalf of the purchasers of the Company's stock in various class periods, beginning as early as May 29, 2003 and ending as late as January 14, 2005. The majority of these lawsuits were filed in the District of Arizona. Four actions were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and one in the Eastern District of Michigan. The New York and Michigan actions were transferred to the District of Arizona. The class actions were consolidated by Judge Susan Bolton and Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel were selected. The Lead Plaintiff filed a consolidated complaint (which became the operative complaint for all of the class actions) on August 29, 2005. The operative class period is May 29, 2003 to January 11, 2005. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss the consolidated complaint, which was fully briefed for the Court but was not decided.

The consolidated complaint alleges, among other things, violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and Rule 10B-5, promulgated thereunder, and seeks unspecified monetary damages and other relief against all defendants. The consolidated amended complaint generally alleges that the Company and the individual defendants made false or misleading public statements regarding, among other things, the safety of the Company's products and the Company's ability to meet its sales goals, including the validity of a \$1.5 million sales order with the Company's distributor, Davidson's, in the fourth quarter of 2004. The consolidated complaint also alleges that product defects were leading to excessive product returns by customers.

On October 11, 2006, the parties filed a joint Stipulation of Settlement and related documents, setting forth terms of settlement including, among other things, full releases of any and all related known or unknown claims among the plaintiff, plaintiff class and the defendants, and payment of \$20 million from TASER for the benefit of the plaintiff class to be comprised of \$12 million in cash (approximately \$4.1 million to be provided from the Directors' and Officers' Liability Insurance policy), and \$8 million in Company common stock valued as set forth in the Stipulation. At the Company's election, the stock portion of the settlement may be funded with cash. On December 14, 2006, the Court entered an order, which among other things, approved preliminarily the Stipulation of Settlement, provided for notice of the Settlement, set forth for the submissions of objections to and exclusions from the Settlement, and set a final Settlement Hearing. On March 19, 2007, the Court entered the Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, which, among other things, approved the settlement terms as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement and dismissed with prejudice the consolidated securities class actions. The Company made the final payment of \$8 million in cash in settlement of the shareholder class action litigation in March 2007. On April 17, 2007, the Court entered an additional order which, among other things, awarded plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs to be paid out of the settlement amount.

Shareholder Derivative Litigation

Beginning on or about January 11, 2005, numerous shareholder derivative actions were also filed against the Company's officers and directors. Such actions have been filed in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, the Arizona Superior Court in Maricopa County, and the Delaware Chancery Court in New Castle County. The derivative actions pending in the Arizona Superior Court and the Delaware Chancery Court have been stayed pending resolution of the consolidated Arizona District Court action.

The plaintiffs in the Arizona District Court action filed a consolidated complaint on May 13, 2005. The Company and the individual defendants filed motions to dismiss the consolidated complaint on August 19, 2005. On March 17, 2006, the Court denied the motions to dismiss. Defendants answered the consolidated complaint on April 21, 2006. Discovery commenced but no trial date was set.

The derivative complaints are based on similar facts and events as those alleged in the securities class action complaints. The complaints generally allege that the individual defendants breached the fiduciary duties that they owe to the Company and its shareholders by reason of their positions as officers and/or directors of the Company. The complaints claim that such duties were breached by defendants' disclosure of allegedly false or misleading statements about the safety and effectiveness of Company products and the Company's financial results. The complaints also claim that fiduciary duties were breached by defendants' alleged use of non-public information regarding the safety of Company products and the Company's financial

condition and future business prospects to commit insider trading of the Company's stock. The derivative plaintiffs seek damages and restitutionary, equitable, injunctive and other relief.

On December 8, 2006, the parties filed with the Arizona District Court a joint Stipulation of Settlement and related documents, which set forth the terms of settlement of the Arizona District Court action, the Arizona Superior Court action and the Delaware Chancery Court action. Settlement terms include, among other things, the Company's adoption of certain corporate governance provisions, settlement between the defendants and the Company's insurance carrier, and the Company's payment of plaintiffs' attorneys' fees in the amount of \$1.75 million in Company common stock valued as set forth in the Stipulation. On December 13, 2006, the Arizona District Court entered an order, which among other things, approved preliminarily the Stipulation of Settlement, provided for notice of the Settlement, set forth for the submissions of objections to the Settlement, and set a final Settlement Hearing. On March 14, 2007, the Arizona District Court entered the Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, which, among other things, approved the settlement terms as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement and dismissed with prejudice the Arizona District Court action. On March 20, 2007, the Delaware Chancery Court entered an order granting the parties' stipulation of dismissal, which, among other things, dismissed with prejudice the Delaware Chancery Court action. On March 23, 2007, the Arizona Superior Court entered an order granting the parties' stipulation of dismissal, which, among other things, dismissed with prejudice the Arizona Superior Court action. The remaining liability of \$1.75 million for settlement of the derivative litigation was paid in stock in the second quarter of 2007.

Table of Contents

TASER INTERNATIONAL, INC.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (unaudited) — Continued

Product Liability Litigation

The Company is currently named as a defendant in 42 lawsuits in which the plaintiffs allege either wrongful death or personal injury in situations in which the TASER device was used (or present) by law enforcement officers or during training exercises. Companion cases arising from the same incident have been combined into one for reporting purposes. In addition, 54 other lawsuits have been dismissed and are not included in this number. Three of the lawsuits that have been dismissed or judgment entered in favor of TASER, are on appeal. With respect to each of these pending 42 lawsuits, the following table lists the name of plaintiff, the date the Company was served with process, the jurisdiction in which the case is pending, the type of claim and the status of the matter. This table also lists those cases that were dismissed during the most recent fiscal quarter. Cases that were dismissed in prior fiscal quarters are not included in this table. In each of the pending lawsuits, the plaintiff is seeking monetary damages from the Company. The defense of each of these lawsuits has been submitted to our insurance carriers that maintained insurance coverage during these applicable periods and we continue to maintain product liability insurance coverage with varying limits and deductibles. Our product liability insurance coverage during these periods ranged from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 in coverage limits and from \$10,000 to \$500,000 in per incident deductibles. We are defending each of these lawsuits vigorously.

Plaintiff	Month Served	Jurisdiction	Claim Type	Status
Alvarado	4/2003	CA Superior Court	Wrongful Death	Jury Verdict for TASER, Appeal Pending
City of Madera	6/2003	CA Superior Court	Wrongful Death	Dismissed by Summary Judgment, Appeal Pending
Glowczenski	10/2004	US District Court, ED NY	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
LeBlanc	12/2004	CA Superior Court, Los Angeles County	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
M. Elsholtz	12/2004	TX District Court	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Washington	5/2005	US District Court, ED CA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Sanders	5/2005	US District Court ED CA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Graff	9/2005	US District Court, AZ	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Tucker	10/2005	US District Court, NV	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Heston	11/2005	US District Court, ND CA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Rosa	11/2005	US District Court, ND CA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Yeagley	11/2005	Hillsborough County Circuit Court, FL	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Neal-Lomax	12/2005	US District Court, NV	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase

Yanga Williams	12/2005	Gwinnett County State Court, GA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Mann	12/2005	US District Court, ND GA, Rome Div	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Robert Williams	1/2006	US District Court, TX	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Lee	1/2006	Davidson County, TN Circuit Court	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase, Trial Scheduled for June 2008.
Zaragoza	2/2006	CA Superior Court, Sacramento County	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Bagnell	7/2006	Supreme Court for British Columbia, Canada	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Salazar	7/2006	Maricopa County Superior Court, AZ	Wrongful Death	Dismissed
Gillson	7/2006	US District Court, NV	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Hollman	8/2006	US District Court, ED NY	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Oliver	9/2006	US District Court, MD FL, Orlando	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Teran/LiSaola	10/2006	CA District Court	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Short, Rhonda	10/2006	US District Court, ND TX, Forth Worth	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Fernandez	11/2006	US District Court, ND CA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Brown	12/2006	15 th Judicial District Court, Lafayette Parish, LA	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Moreno	12/2006	CA Superior Court, Los Angeles County (Companion to LeBlanc Litigation)	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Augustine	1/2007	11 th Judicial Circuit Court, Miami-Dade	Wrongful Death	Discovery Phase
Nunez	1/2007	County, FL US District Court, ND TX, Amarillo	Wrongful Death	Dismissed

Smith

2/2007

Civil District
Court, Orleans
Parish, LA

Wrongful Death

Discovery Phase

Table of Contents

TASER INTERNATIONAL, INC.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (unaudited) — Continued

Plaintiff	Month Served	Jurisdiction	Claim Type	Status
Pierson, Preston	2/2007	Superior Court of CA, San Bernardino County US District Court	Wrongful Death	Dismissed
Toloskdo-Parker	5/2007	N D, CA	Wrongful Death	Complaint Served
McCargo	5/2007	Circuit Court Bradley County, TN	Wrongful Death	Dismissed
Powers	11/2003	AZ Superior Court	Training Injury	Verdict for TASER, Appeal Pending
Cook	8/2004	NV District Court	Training Injury	Dismissed
Gerdon	8/2005	AZ Superior Court	Training Injury	Dismissed
Herring	8/2005	Circuit Court of City of St. Louis, MO	Training Injury	Dismissed
Stewart	10/2005	Circuit Court for Broward County, FL	Training Injury	Discovery Phase
Lewandowski	1/2006	US District Court, NV	Training Injury	Partial Motion to Dismiss Granted, Discovery Phase
Peterson	1/2006	US District Court, NV	Training Injury	Discovery Phase
Husband	3/2006	British Columbia Supreme Court, Canada	Training Injury	Discovery Phase
Richthofen	7/2006	22 nd Judicial District Court, St. Tammany Parish, LA	Training Injury	Dismissed
Wilson	8/2006	US District Court, ND GA	Training Injury	Discovery Phase
Diamond	8/2006	Circuit Court, Douglas County, Oregon	Training Injury	Dismissed
Bynum	10/2005	US District Court SD NY	Injury During Arrest	Discovery Phase
Lopez	11/2005	US District Court, ND IL Eastern Div	Injury During Police Call	Discovery Phase
Bellemore	2/2006	AZ Superior Court	Injury During Arrest	Discovery Phase

Wieffenbach	6/2006	Circuit Court of 12 th Judicial District, Will County, IL	Injury During Arrest	Discovery Phase
Cruz	7/2006	CA Superior Court, Los Angeles County	Injury During Arrest	Discovery Phase
Molina	9/2006	US District Court, ND West Virginia	Injury During Detention	Discovery Phase
Short, Harvey	10/2006	US District Court, SD West Virginia	Injury During Arrest	Complaint Served
Payne	10/2006	Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois	Injury During Arrest	Discovery Phase
Powell	12/2006	US District Court, ND IL, Eastern Division	Injury During Arrest (3 rd Party Complaint against TASER)	Complaint Served
Gomez	5/2007	Circuit Court 11 th Judicial Dist. FL	Injury During Arrest	Complaint Served